

MOST INTERVAL EXCHANGES HAVE NO ROOTS

DANIEL BERNAZZANI

ABSTRACT. Let T be an m -interval exchange transformation. By the rank of T we mean the dimension of the $\mathbb{Q}$ -vector space spanned by the lengths of the exchanged intervals. We prove that if T is minimal and the rank of T is greater than $1 + \lfloor m/2 \rfloor$, then T cannot be written as a power of another interval exchange. We also demonstrate that this estimate on the rank cannot be improved.

In the case that T is a minimal 3-interval exchange transformation, we prove a stronger result: T cannot be written as a power of another interval exchange if and only if T satisfies Keane's infinite distinct orbit condition. In the course of proving this result, we give a classification (up to conjugacy) of those minimal IETs whose discontinuities all belong to a single orbit.

1. INTRODUCTION

An interval exchange transformation (IET) is a bijective map $T : [0, 1) \rightarrow [0, 1)$ defined by partitioning the unit interval $[0, 1)$ into finitely many subintervals and then rearranging these subintervals by translation. An example is illustrated in Figure 1, which shows the unit interval both before and after the action of T .




FIGURE 1. An IET

The dynamical properties of a single IET have been studied extensively. Some early papers in the field are those of Keane [5, 6], Rauzy [11], and Veech [13]. In 1982, Veech [12] and Masur [7] independently proved that almost every IET is uniquely ergodic. An exposition of these results can be found in Viana's survey [14]. More recently, Avila and Forni [1] proved that almost every IET is weakly mixing and Chaika [3] proved that every ergodic transformation is disjoint from almost every IET. The study of IETs is closely related to the study of translation surfaces. See the surveys of Viana [14] and Yoccoz [16] for a discussion of translation surfaces and their connection to IETs.

The focus of this paper is different from those mentioned above. The set of all IETs forms a group $\mathbb{G}$ under composition and we investigate whether certain elements of this group can be written as powers of other elements. Before describing our results, we mention several other papers which concern the group $\mathbb{G}$. Novak [8] studied the discontinuity growth of IETs and used this to classify centralizers in $\mathbb{G}$ and determine the automorphism group of $\mathbb{G}$. Novak [9] also classified continuous one-parameter flows in $\mathbb{G}$. Vorobets' paper [15] presents several characterizations of the commutator subgroup of $\mathbb{G}$, some of them due to Sah. Boshernitzan [2] gave a characterization of the subgroup of $\mathbb{G}$ generated by finite order elements and rotations in terms of the Sah-Arnoux-Fathi invariant. Despite the recent interest, there is still much that is not known about $\mathbb{G}$. For example, it is unknown whether or not a subgroup of $\mathbb{G}$ could be isomorphic to a non-abelian free group. See [4] and [10] for some results related to this open question. It is also unknown whether or not $\mathbb{G}$ contains any subgroups of intermediate growth.

In order to formally define an IET, we need two pieces of information: the lengths of the exchanged subintervals, and the permutation which describes how the subintervals are rearranged. The permutation group of the set $\{1, 2, \dots, m\}$ will be denoted by S_m . All permutations will be written in one line notation.

Definition 1.1. Fix $m \in \mathbb{N}$. Let $\pi \in S_m$ and let $\lambda = (\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \dots, \lambda_m)$ be a vector in the simplex

$$\Delta_m = \left\{ (\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \dots, \lambda_m) \in \mathbb{R}^m : \lambda_i > 0, \sum_i \lambda_i = 1 \right\}.$$

Let

$$\beta_0 = 0 \text{ and } \beta_j = \sum_{i=1}^j \lambda_j \text{ for } 1 \leq j \leq m.$$

The set $\{\beta_0, \beta_1, \dots, \beta_m\}$ partitions $[0, 1)$ into m subintervals of the form $I_j = [\beta_{j-1}, \beta_j)$. We can now define a map $T_{(\pi, \lambda)} : [0, 1) \rightarrow [0, 1)$ by

$$T_{(\pi, \lambda)}(x) = x - \left(\sum_{i < j} \lambda_i \right) + \left(\sum_{\pi(i) < \pi(j)} \lambda_i \right), \text{ for } x \in I_j.$$

The map $T_{(\pi, \lambda)}$ rearranges the intervals I_j by translation according to the permutation π . We will refer to any map constructed in this manner as an IET. For convenience, we sometimes drop the reference to π and λ and simply denote the map $T_{(\pi, \lambda)}$ by T .

It is convenient to classify IETs in the following way.

Definition 1.2. Let T be an IET. We will say that T is an m -IET if T has precisely $m - 1$ points of discontinuity.

Unfortunately, the combinatorial data (π, λ) which goes into the definition of an IET does not always reflect the number of discontinuities. Since the restriction of $T_{(\pi, \lambda)}$ to each of the subintervals I_j is a translation, it is clear that the discontinuities of T must be contained in the set $\{\beta_1, \beta_2, \dots, \beta_{m-1}\}$. However, T may not be discontinuous at all of these points. Whether or not T is continuous at these points

depends on the permutation π . More specifically, if $1 \leq i \leq m-1$, then $T_{(\pi, \lambda)}$ is discontinuous at β_i if and only if $\pi(i+1) \neq \pi(i) + 1$. Motivated by this, we adopt the following definition.

Definition 1.3. We will say that $\pi \in S_m$ is *admissible* if $\pi(i+1) \neq \pi(i) + 1$ for $1 \leq i \leq m-1$.

For example, the permutation $\tau = (321) \in S_3$ is admissible, while the permutation $\sigma = (312) \in S_3$ is not. It is clear that if $\pi \in S_m$ is admissible, then any IET of the form $T_{(\pi, \lambda)}$ is an m -IET. Conversely, the following is true.

Proposition 1.1. *Let T be an m -IET. There exists an admissible permutation $\pi \in S_m$ and a vector $\lambda \in \Delta_m$, both of which are unique, such that $T = T_{(\pi, \lambda)}$.*

Proof. Let $\gamma_1 < \gamma_2 < \dots < \gamma_{m-1}$ be the points at which T is discontinuous. Let $\gamma_0 = 0$ and $\gamma_m = 1$.

Suppose that π and λ exist. Since π is admissible, $T = T_{(\pi, \lambda)}$ must be discontinuous at $\beta_1, \beta_2, \dots, \beta_{m-1}$. Since T has precisely $m-1$ discontinuities, it follows that $\gamma_j = \beta_j$ for $j = 1, 2, \dots, m-1$. This uniquely specifies λ , since $\lambda_j = \beta_j - \beta_{j-1} = \gamma_j - \gamma_{j-1}$. It also uniquely specifies π , since the way in which T rearranges the intervals $[\gamma_{j-1}, \gamma_j]$ is intrinsic to the map T . This proves that π and λ are unique if they exist.

To prove existence, let $\lambda_j = \gamma_j - \gamma_{j-1}$ or $j = 1, 2, \dots, m$. Since $\sum_j \lambda_j = 1$, the vector $\lambda = (\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \dots, \lambda_m)$ belongs to Δ_m . Let $\pi \in S_m$ be the permutation which describes how the points $\gamma_0, \gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_{m-1}$ are rearranged by T . That is, if $T(\gamma_{j_0}) < T(\gamma_{j_1}) < \dots < T(\gamma_{j_{m-1}})$, then $\pi(j_i + 1) = i + 1$ for $i = 0, 1, \dots, m-1$. By construction, $T = T_{(\pi, \lambda)}$. Since T is discontinuous at $\gamma_1, \gamma_2, \dots, \gamma_{m-1}$, π is admissible. $\square$

As we mentioned previously, the set of all IETs forms a group $\mathbb{G}$ under composition. We will denote n -fold compositions $T \circ \dots \circ T$ by T^n . We will say that T has an n^{th} root in $\mathbb{G}$ if there exists $S \in \mathbb{G}$ such that $T = S^n$.

For example, let T be a 2-IET. If π and λ are chosen according to Proposition 1.1, then $\pi = (21)$ and $\lambda = (1 - \alpha, \alpha)$ for some $\alpha \in (0, 1)$. If we identify $[0, 1]$ with the unit circle $\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}$, the map T corresponds to a rotation by angle α . If we let S be the 2-IET corresponding to a rotation by angle $\alpha/2$, then it is clear that $T = S^2$. Thus T has a square root in $\mathbb{G}$. More generally, if S is the 2-IET corresponding to a rotation by α/n , then $T = S^n$. So T has an n^{th} root for any $n \geq 2$.

Deciding whether or not a 3-IET has any roots in $\mathbb{G}$ is more complicated. One reason is that a root of a 3-IET need not be a 3-IET. For example, let $0 < \alpha < 1/3$ and let T be the 3-IET defined by

$$\tau = (321) \text{ and } \lambda = \left(\frac{1}{3} - \alpha, \alpha, \frac{2}{3} \right).$$

Let S be the 6-IET defined by

$$\tau' = (652143) \text{ and } \lambda' = \left(\frac{1}{3} - \frac{\alpha}{2}, \frac{\alpha}{2}, \frac{1}{3} - \frac{\alpha}{2}, \frac{\alpha}{2}, \frac{1}{3} - \frac{\alpha}{2}, \frac{\alpha}{2} \right).$$

One can check that $T = S^2$.

In contrast to the above examples, the main results of this paper show that, in a certain sense, “most” IETs do not have any roots in $\mathbb{G}$. In order to precisely state our results, we recall some well-known definitions and facts about IETs.

Definition 1.4. Let X be a topological space. Let $T : X \rightarrow X$. By the orbit of a point x we mean the set $\mathcal{O}_T(x) = \{T^k(x) : k \in \mathbb{Z}\}$. We say that T is *minimal* if $\mathcal{O}_T(x)$ is dense in X for every $x \in X$.

As we will see shortly, IETs are typically minimal. The results of this paper only pertain to minimal IETs. We make no attempt to address the existence of roots of IETs which are not minimal.

There are two useful conditions which guarantee that an IET is minimal. In order to state them, we need the following definitions.

Definition 1.5. Let T be an m -IET with discontinuities $\beta_1, \beta_2, \dots, \beta_{m-1}$. We say that T satisfies the i.d.o.c. (infinite distinct orbit condition) if each of the orbits $\mathcal{O}_T(\beta_1), \mathcal{O}_T(\beta_2), \dots, \mathcal{O}_T(\beta_{m-1})$ is infinite and $\mathcal{O}_T(\beta_i) \cap \mathcal{O}_T(\beta_j) = \emptyset$ for $i \neq j$.

Definition 1.6. Let T be an m -IET. Choose π and λ according to Proposition 1.1. We will refer to the dimension of the $\mathbb{Q}$ -vector space spanned by $\{\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \dots, \lambda_m\}$ as the *rank* of T . This will be denoted by $\text{rank}(T)$.

Keane [5] introduced the i.d.o.c. and proved the following two results. Both may be seen as generalizations of the fact that a circle rotation by angle α is minimal if $\alpha \notin \mathbb{Q}$.

Proposition 1.2. (Keane) *If T is an m -IET which satisfies the i.d.o.c., and $m \geq 2$, then T is minimal.*

Recall that a permutation $\pi \in S_m$ is said to be irreducible if $\pi(\{1, 2, \dots, k\}) \neq \{1, 2, \dots, k\}$ for any $k < m$.

Proposition 1.3. (Keane) *Let $m \geq 2$ and suppose that $\pi \in S_m$ is irreducible and admissible. If $\text{rank}(T_{(\pi, \lambda)}) = m$, then T satisfies the i.d.o.c. and is therefore minimal.*

As we remarked previously, a “typical” IET is minimal. This follows from Proposition 1.3: if $\pi \in S_m$ is irreducible and admissible, then for Lebesgue almost every choice of $\lambda \in \Delta_m$, the map $T_{(\pi, \lambda)}$ will be of rank m and will therefore be minimal.

We have already seen that every minimal 2-IET possesses roots in $\mathbb{G}$. Our first result gives a complete characterization of those minimal 3-IETs which have roots in $\mathbb{G}$.

Theorem 1.1. *Let T be a minimal 3-IET. Then T has an n^{th} root in $\mathbb{G}$ for some $n \geq 2$ if and only if T fails to satisfy the i.d.o.c.*

The proofs of all of our results, including that of Theorem 1.1, will be given in the next section of this paper.

If T is a 3-IET and $\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \lambda_3$ are the lengths of the exchanged subintervals, then it is straightforward to check that the first return map to the interval $[0, 1 - \lambda_3]$ is a 2-IET, which can be identified with a rotation by angle $\pm(\lambda_1 - \lambda_3)$. It follows that T is minimal if and only if $\frac{\lambda_1 - \lambda_3}{1 - \lambda_3} \notin \mathbb{Q}$. Assuming that T is minimal, T satisfies

the i.d.o.c. if and only if the orbits of 0 and λ_1 under the first return map are distinct. This amounts to the statement that for every pair of integers n, m , we have $n(\lambda_1 - \lambda_3) \neq \lambda_1 + m(1 - \lambda_3)$. Thus, it is possible to decide whether or not T has any roots in $\mathbb{G}$, provided one understands the rational dependencies among $\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \lambda_3$.

Our proof of Theorem 1.1 is based on another result, which is interesting in its own right. In order to state this result, we need to consider a special kind of IET. Let $I = [a, b)$ be subinterval of $[0, 1)$ and let $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$. We define the restricted rotation $R_{\alpha, I}$ as follows. Let $\bar{\alpha}$ denote the unique number in $[0, b - a)$ such that $\bar{\alpha} \equiv \alpha \pmod{b - a}$. The map $R_{\alpha, I}$ is the IET which leaves the intervals $[0, a)$ and $[b, 1)$ fixed and interchanges the intervals $[a, b - \bar{\alpha})$ and $[b - \bar{\alpha}, b)$.

We can now state our next theorem. The word “conjugate” refers to conjugation in the group $\mathbb{G}$.

Theorem 1.2. *Let T be a minimal IET. Suppose that the discontinuities of T all belong to a single orbit. Then precisely one of the following is true:*

- (1) *T is conjugate to a 2-IET*
- (2) *there exists an integer $d > 1$ and $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$ such that T is conjugate to the 3-IET $P \circ R_{\alpha, I}$, where $I = [1 - \frac{1}{d}, 1)$ and P is the 2-IET which exchanges the intervals I and $[0, 1) \setminus I$.*

In either case, T has an n^{th} root in $\mathbb{G}$ for some $n \geq 2$.

One of the claims in Theorem 1.1 follows immediately from Theorem 1.2. If T is a minimal 3-IET with discontinuities β_1, β_2 , and T does not satisfy the i.d.o.c., then the orbits of β_1 and β_2 must coincide: $\mathcal{O}_T(\beta_1) = \mathcal{O}_T(\beta_2)$. The last statement in Theorem 1.2 now tells us that T has a root in $\mathbb{G}$.

Theorem 1.2 is related to the following construction, which is standard in ergodic theory. Let $(X, T : X \rightarrow X)$ be a dynamical system and let $f : X \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ be bounded. We can define a new system (X_f, T_f) as follows. The points in X_f are of the form (x, i) where $x \in X$ and $1 \leq i \leq f(x) \in \mathbb{N}$. The map T_f is defined by

$$T_f(x, i) = \begin{cases} (x, i + 1) & \text{if } i + 1 \leq f(x) \\ (T(x), 1) & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$


The space X_f may be visualized as tower over X . The map T_f transports a point up to the next level of the tower, unless the point is already at the top, in which case it is transported back to the first level according to the original map T .

In particular, consider the case when $X = [0, 1)$, T is a minimal 2-IET, and $f : [0, 1) \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ is constant on each of the exchanged subintervals, say

$$(1) \quad f(x) = \begin{cases} m & \text{if } x \in I_1 \\ n & \text{if } x \in I_2 \end{cases}$$

The action of the map T_f is depicted in Figure 2. We may view T_f as an IET by laying the levels of the tower end to end, and then rescaling so that total length of the resulting interval is one.

Using Figure 2 as a guide, we see that the discontinuities of T_f all belong to a single orbit. Conversely, our proof of Theorem 1.2 will make it clear that every

FIGURE 2. The map T_f

minimal IET whose discontinuities belong to a single orbit is conjugate to an IET of the form T_f , where T is a minimal 2-IET and f is as in (1). Thus Theorem 1.2 may be seen as a classification of IETs which can be constructed in this manner. Actually, we can be slightly more precise. Though it is not apparent from the statement of Theorem 1.2, our proof will show that if m and n are as in (1), then we have the following dichotomy.

- (i) If m and n are relatively prime, then T_f is conjugate to a 2-IET.
- (ii) If m and n are not relatively prime, and $d > 1$ is their greatest common divisor, then T_f is conjugate to a 3-IET of the form $P \circ R_{\alpha, I}$, where $I = [1 - \frac{1}{d}, 1)$, and P is the 2-IET which interchanges I and $[0, 1) \setminus I$.

It is natural to wonder whether or not Theorem 1.1 could be generalized to the case of an m -IET, where $m > 3$. This cannot be done. The reason is simple: if T satisfies the i.d.o.c., then so do all of its powers T^n for $n \geq 2$.

Nevertheless, Theorem 1.1 does imply another result, which, as we shall see, can be generalized considerably.

Corollary 1.1. *Let T be a minimal 3-IET of rank three. Then T does not have any roots in $\mathbb{G}$.*

Proof. Proposition 1.3 implies that T satisfies the i.d.o.c. Therefore the claim follows immediately from Theorem 1.1. $\square$

Corollary 1.1 suggests that we might be able to decide whether or not an IET has any roots by examining its rank. In particular, one might conjecture that if $m > 3$, then a minimal m -IET of rank m has no roots in $\mathbb{G}$. We prove that this is so. In fact, we establish a more precise result.

Theorem 1.3. *Let T be a minimal m -IET. Suppose that $\text{rank}(T) > 1 + \lfloor m/2 \rfloor$. Then T does not have any roots in $\mathbb{G}$.*

Thus, for example, a minimal 7-IET of rank at least five cannot have any roots in $\mathbb{G}$.

Theorem 1.3 justifies our earlier claim that “most” IETs have no roots in $\mathbb{G}$. To be precise, let $m \geq 3$. Fix some admissible irreducible permutation $\pi \in S_m$. The set of vectors $\lambda = (\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \dots, \lambda_m) \in \Delta_m$ for which $\text{rank}(T_{(\pi, \lambda)}) = m$ is a dense G_δ set of full Lebesgue measure. If λ belongs to this set, Proposition 1.3 implies that $T_{(\pi, \lambda)}$ is minimal. Comparing these observations with Theorem 1.3 proves the following.

Corollary 1.2. *Let $m \geq 3$. Fix an admissible irreducible permutation $\pi \in S_m$. Let*

$$A = \left\{ \lambda \in \Delta_m : T_{(\pi, \lambda)} \text{ has no roots in } \mathbb{G} \right\}.$$

Then A is a residual subset of Δ_m of full Lebesgue measure.

For each positive integer m there are examples of minimal m -IETs of rank $1 + \lfloor m/2 \rfloor$ which do have roots in $\mathbb{G}$. Thus the estimate on $\text{rank}(T)$ given in Theorem 1.3 cannot be improved. In describing these examples it will be convenient to consider even and odd m separately.

Suppose first that m is even. Choose $\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \dots, \alpha_{m/2} \in \mathbb{R}$ so that the set $\{1, \alpha_1, \alpha_2, \dots, \alpha_{m/2}\}$ is linearly independent over $\mathbb{Q}$. For $j = 1, 2, \dots, m/2$, let $I_j = [(j-1)\frac{2}{m}, j\frac{2}{m}]$. Let S be the 2-IET which interchanges the intervals $I_{m/2}$ and $[0, 1) \setminus I_{m/2}$. The map

$$T = S \circ R_{\alpha_1, I_1} \circ R_{\alpha_2, I_2} \circ \dots \circ R_{\alpha_{m/2}, I_{m/2}}$$

is a minimal m -IET of rank $1 + \lfloor m/2 \rfloor$. Let $(\beta_1, \beta_2, \dots, \beta_{m/2})$ be the unique solution to the system of equations

$$\begin{pmatrix} 2 & 1 & 1 & \dots & 1 \\ 1 & 2 & 1 & \dots & 1 \\ 1 & 1 & 2 & \dots & 1 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 1 & 1 & 1 & \dots & 2 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \beta_1 \\ \beta_2 \\ \beta_3 \\ \vdots \\ \beta_{m/2} \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \alpha_1 \\ \alpha_2 \\ \alpha_3 \\ \vdots \\ \alpha_{m/2} \end{pmatrix}.$$

One can check that

$$(S \circ R_{\beta_1, I_1} \circ R_{\beta_2, I_2} \circ \dots \circ R_{\beta_{m/2}, I_{m/2}})^{1+m/2} = T.$$

Now suppose that m is odd. Choose $\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \dots, \alpha_{\lfloor m/2 \rfloor} \in \mathbb{R}$ so that the set $\{1, \alpha_1, \alpha_2, \dots, \alpha_{\lfloor m/2 \rfloor}\}$ is linearly independent over $\mathbb{Q}$. For $j = 1, 2, \dots, 1 + \lfloor m/2 \rfloor$, let $I_j = [(j-1)\frac{1}{1+\lfloor m/2 \rfloor}, j\frac{1}{1+\lfloor m/2 \rfloor}]$. Let S be the 2-IET which interchanges the intervals $I_{1+\lfloor m/2 \rfloor}$ and $[0, 1) \setminus I_{1+\lfloor m/2 \rfloor}$. As before, the map

$$T = S \circ R_{\alpha_1, I_1} \circ R_{\alpha_2, I_2} \circ \dots \circ R_{\alpha_{\lfloor m/2 \rfloor}, I_{\lfloor m/2 \rfloor}}$$

is a minimal m -IET of rank $1 + \lfloor m/2 \rfloor$. Let $(\beta_1, \beta_2, \dots, \beta_{1+\lfloor m/2 \rfloor})$ be the unique solution to the system of equations

$$\begin{pmatrix} 2 & 1 & 1 & 1 & \cdots & 1 \\ 1 & 2 & 1 & 1 & \cdots & 1 \\ 1 & 1 & 2 & 1 & \cdots & 1 \\ 1 & 1 & 1 & 2 & \cdots & 1 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & \cdots & 2 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \beta_1 \\ \beta_2 \\ \beta_3 \\ \vdots \\ \beta_{\lfloor m/2 \rfloor} \\ \beta_{1+\lfloor m/2 \rfloor} \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \alpha_1 \\ \alpha_2 \\ \alpha_3 \\ \vdots \\ \alpha_{\lfloor m/2 \rfloor} \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

We then have

$$(S \circ R_{\beta_1, I_1} \circ R_{\beta_2, I_2} \circ \cdots \circ R_{\beta_{1+\lfloor m/2 \rfloor}, I_{1+\lfloor m/2 \rfloor}})^{2+\lfloor m/2 \rfloor} = T.$$

It should be noted that although the hypotheses of Theorem 1.3 are sufficient to guarantee that an IET has no roots in $\mathbb{G}$, they are by no means necessary. In fact, for any $m \geq 3$ there exist minimal m -IETs of rank two which have no roots in $\mathbb{G}$. The discussion following Theorem 1.1 already demonstrates this in the case $m = 3$. Examples for $m > 3$ can be constructed inductively. We will not go into the details of this.

Finally, we mention that our work is related to some results of Novak. In his paper [8], Novak analyzes the discontinuity growth rate of IETs. Novak proves that if T is an IET, then the number of discontinuities of T^n is either bounded independently of n or else grows linearly in n . Novak uses this result to classify centralizers in $\mathbb{G}$. Given $T \in \mathbb{G}$, let $C(T)$ denote the centralizer of T and let $\langle T \rangle$ denote the cyclic subgroup generated by T . Among other results, Novak shows that if T is minimal and has linear discontinuity growth, then the quotient $C(T)/\langle T \rangle$ is finite. A different proof of this result appears in [4].

Novak's result on centralizers is related to our investigation of the existence of roots in $\mathbb{G}$. Specifically, if T has infinite order in $\mathbb{G}$, but $C(T)/\langle T \rangle$ is finite, then it follows that T cannot have n^{th} roots in $\mathbb{G}$ for all sufficiently large n . Nevertheless, the assumption that T is minimal and has linear discontinuity growth is not enough to guarantee that T has no roots in $\mathbb{G}$. For example, let S be a 3-IET satisfying the i.d.o.c. and let $T = S^2$. One can verify that T is a minimal 5-IET which satisfies the i.d.o.c. As Novak points out, if $m \geq 3$, then any m -IET satisfying the i.d.o.c. will exhibit linear discontinuity growth. In particular, T has linear discontinuity growth. However, T has a square root by construction.

2. PROOFS OF THEOREMS 1.1, 1.2, AND 1.3

This section contains the proofs of our results. Given an IET T , let $D(T)$ denote the set of points at which T is discontinuous.

It is well-known that if T is an IET and $[a, b] \subseteq [0, 1]$, then the induced map on $[a, b]$ is an IET (up to rescaling). The following lemma is an elaborate formulation of this fact. A proof can be found in section four of Viana's survey [14].

Lemma 2.1. *Let T be an IET. Suppose that $J = [a, b]$ is a subinterval of $[0, 1]$ such that $(a, b) \cap D(T) = \emptyset$. Let $P \subseteq J$ consist of those points $x \in (a, b)$ for which there exists an $n \geq 1$ such that $T^j(x) \notin J \cup D(T) \cup \{a, b\}$ for $0 < j < n$ and*

$T^n(x) \in D(T) \cup \{a, b\}$. The set P is finite. Therefore P partitions J into finitely many subintervals $J_1, J_2, \dots, J_k$. There exist positive integers $m_1, m_2, \dots, m_k$ such that

- (1) for each i , the restriction of T^j to J_i is a translation for $1 \leq j \leq m_i$
- (2) for each i , $T^j(J_i) \cap J = \emptyset$ for $0 < j < m_i$
- (3) for each i , T^{m_i} translates J_i onto a subinterval of J
- (4) the intervals $T^{m_i}(J_i)$, $1 \leq i \leq k$, are pairwise disjoint

Let J be a subinterval of $[0, 1)$ satisfying the hypothesis of Lemma 1. For each $x \in J$, let $n_J(x) = \inf\{n \geq 1 : T^n(x) \in J\}$. According to the lemma, $n_J(x) = m_i$ for $x \in J_i$. The map $T_J : J \rightarrow J$ defined by $T_J(x) = T^{n_J(x)}(x)$ is the first return map to J . The integers $m_1, m_2, \dots, m_k$ are the return times.

Though not explicitly stated in Lemma 2.1, it is not hard to see that the intervals $T^j(J_i)$, for $1 \leq i \leq k$ and $1 \leq j \leq m_i - 1$, are pairwise disjoint. Moreover, the set $A := \bigcup_{i=1}^k \bigcup_{j=0}^{m_i-1} T^j(J_i)$ is clearly T -invariant (that is, $T(A) = A$). Therefore, if T is minimal, it must be that $A = [0, 1)$.

In what follows, we will be concerned with counting the number of distinct T -orbits to which the points of $D(T)$ belong. Motivated by this, we make the following definition.

Definition 2.1. Let T be an IET. A finite sequence of points $x_1, x_2, \dots, x_k$, $k \geq 1$, in $[0, 1)$ will be called a T -chain if x_1 and x_k both belong to $D(T) \cup \{0\}$ and $T(x_i) = x_{i+1}$ for $i = 1, 2, \dots, k-1$. It will be convenient to refer to the set $\{x_1, x_2, \dots, x_k\}$ itself as a T -chain. By a maximal T -chain we mean a T -chain which is not a proper subset of another T -chain.

Remark. According to the above definition, it is possible that a T -chain consists of a single point. This is what distinguishes a T -chain from a connection, a term that is used commonly in the literature.

We note that if T is minimal, then

- (1) every point in $D(T)$ is contained in a T -chain
- (2) since T has no periodic points, every T -chain is contained in a unique maximal T -chain
- (3) any two distinct maximal T -chains must be disjoint from one another

Suppose that T is minimal and that there are precisely q maximal T -chains, say $C_1, C_2, \dots, C_q$. Let $C = \bigcup_{i=1}^q C_i$. Let $x \in C$. If x is greater than all other points in C , let $y_x = 1$. Otherwise, let y_x be the smallest point in C which is greater than x . The set C partitions the interval $[0, 1)$ into $|C|$ subintervals, each of which is of the form $I_x = [x, y_x)$, where $x \in C$. Let $J = [a, b)$ be any one of these subintervals. Since $D(T) \subseteq C$, T is continuous at all points in the interior of J . This allows us to apply Lemma 2.1.

Lemma 2.2. Let J and q be as described in the preceding paragraph. Then the set P described in Lemma 2.1 contains exactly q points.

Proof. Let $x \in P$. Then there exists an $n_x \geq 1$ such that $T^j(x) \notin J \cup D(T) \cup \{a, b\}$ for $0 < j < n_x$ and $T^{n_x}(x) \in D(T) \cup \{a, b\} \subseteq C$. Since the T -chains $C_1, C_2, \dots, C_q$

are all maximal and $x \notin C = \cup_{i=1}^q C_i$, it is clear that x cannot belong to the forward orbit of any point in C . Therefore $T^{n_x}(x)$ must be the first point in one of the maximal T -chains. Let $y_1, y_2, \dots, y_q$ be the first points in $C_1, C_2, \dots, C_q$, respectively. To prove our claim, we will show that the map $P \rightarrow \{y_1, y_2, \dots, y_q\}$ given by $x \mapsto T^{n_x}(x)$ is a bijection.

To prove that the map is surjective, it suffices to note that since T is minimal, the backward orbit of each y_i must intersect the interior of J . To prove that the map is injective, suppose that $T^{n_x}(x) = T^{n_y}(y)$. The defining properties of n_x imply that $n_x \leq n_y$. By symmetry, $n_y \leq n_x$ and consequently $n_x = n_y$. Therefore $x = y$ since T^{n_x} is a bijection. $\square$

We need one more preliminary result.

Lemma 2.3. *Suppose that T is a minimal m -IET and that there exists an IET S and an integer $n \geq 2$ such that $T = S^n$. Then there are at most $\lfloor m/2 \rfloor$ maximal S -chains.*

Proof. It is clear that S must be minimal. It should be noted that the definition of an IET, together with the fact that $S(0) \neq 0$, implies that $S^{-1}(0) \in D(S)$. Therefore $x_1 \neq 0$ if $\{x_1, x_2, \dots, x_k\}$ is a maximal S -chain.

Let $C = \{x_1, x_2, \dots, x_k\}$ be a maximal S -chain. Let $p = S^{-(n-1)}(x_1)$. Since C is maximal, none of the points $p, S(p), S^2(p), \dots, S^{n-2}(p)$ can belong to $D(S) \cup \{0\}$. Therefore S^{n-1} is continuous at p . Since $p \neq 0$, it follows that the restriction of S^{n-1} to some open interval containing p must be a translation. Combining this with the fact that S is discontinuous at $x_1 = S^{n-1}(p)$, we see that $S^n = T$ is discontinuous at p . Similar reasoning shows that if $x_k \neq 0$, then $S^n = T$ must be discontinuous at x_k .

Suppose that $C_1, C_2, \dots, C_q$ are the distinct maximal S -chains. The argument in the preceding paragraph shows that if $0 \notin C_i = \{x_1, x_2, \dots, x_k\}$ for some i , then C_i contributes two points to the set $D(T)$, namely $S^{-(n-1)}(x_1)$ and x_k . These points must be distinct since $n \geq 2$. If $0 \in C_i = \{x_1, x_2, \dots, x_k\}$, then C_i contributes at least one point to $D(T)$, namely $S^{-(n-1)}(x_1)$. Since there are q maximal S -chains, and 0 belongs to precisely one of them, it follows that $|D(T)| \geq 2q - 1$. On the other hand, $|D(T)| = m - 1$ since T is an m -IET. It follows that $q \leq \lfloor m/2 \rfloor$, as claimed. $\square$

We are now ready to proceed with the proofs of Theorems 1.1, 1.2, and 1.3.

Proof of Theorem 1.2. For clarity, some steps in the proof are stated as separate lemmas.

The assumption that all of the discontinuities of T belong to a single T -orbit is equivalent to the statement that there is only one maximal T -chain. Let C be the unique maximal T -chain. The set C partitions $[0, 1)$ into finitely many subintervals. Let J be any one of these. We apply Lemma 2.1 to J . Lemma 2.2 tells us that the set P described in Lemma 2.1 consists of a single point. Therefore P partitions J into two subintervals J_1, J_2 . Let m_1, m_2 be the pair of return times described by Lemma 2.1. As we observed previously, the intervals $T^j(J_i)$, for $1 \leq i \leq 2$ and $1 \leq j \leq m_i - 1$, are pairwise disjoint. Since T is minimal, we

must have $[0, 1) = \cup_{i=1}^2 \cup_{j=0}^{m_i-1} T^j(J_i)$. Additionally, the first return map T_J must act on J by interchanging J_1 and J_2 . For if this were not the case, then the sets $\cup_{j=0}^{m_1-1} T^j(J_1)$ and $\cup_{j=0}^{m_2-1} T^j(J_2)$ would be T -invariant, contradicting the fact that the T is minimal. Thus T_J is a 2-IET. This gives a clear picture of how T acts on $[0, 1)$ and allows us to prove the following two lemmas.

Lemma 2.4. *If m_1 and m_2 are relatively prime, then T is conjugate to a 2-IET.*

Proof. If $m_1 = m_2 = 1$, then $J_1 \cup J_2 = [0, 1)$ and $T = T_J$. This means T is a 2-IET and there is nothing to prove.

Suppose now that $m_1 + m_2 > 2$. Assume without loss of generality that $m_2 > m_1$. What we do next depends on whether or not $m_2 - m_1$ is greater than m_1 .

Suppose first that $m_2 - m_1 > m_1$. By replacing T by one of its conjugates, we can assume that for $i = 0, 1, \dots, m_1 - 1$, the interval $K_i = T^{m_2-m_1+i}(J_2)$ is immediately to the left of $T^i(J_1)$. Consider the first return map to $K_0 \cup J$. By construction, the first $m_1 - 1$ iterates of S map the interval $K_0 \cup J_1$ outside of $K_0 \cup J$ before T^{m_1} translates $K_0 \cup J_1$ directly onto $J_1 \cup J_2$. Similarly, the first $m_2 - m_1 - 1$ iterates of T map J_2 outside of $K_0 \cup J$ before $T^{m_2-m_1}$ maps J_2 directly onto K_0 . In other words, the first return map $T_{K_0 \cup J}$ is a 2-IET, just as T_J is. However, the pair of return times m_1, m_2 has been replaced by the smaller pair $m_1, m_2 - m_1$. The desired result now follows by induction.

If $m_2 - m_1 < m_1$, we replace T by one of its conjugates so that for $i = 0, 1, \dots, m_1 - 1$, the interval $T^i(J_2)$ is immediately to the right of $T^i(J_1)$. We can also assume that $T^{m_2-1}(J_2)$ is immediately to the left of $T^{m_1-1}(J_1)$. Instead of looking at the first return map to the interval $T^{m_2-1}(J_2) \cup T^{m_1-1}(J_1) \cup T^{m_1-1}(J_2)$, we look at the first return map induced by T^{-1} . As in the previous paragraph, we see that $T^{m_2-1}(J_2)$ has return time $m_2 - m_1$ and that $T^{m_1-1}(J_1) \cup T^{m_1-1}(J_2)$ has return time m_1 . It follows by induction that T^{-1} is conjugate to a 2-IET, which implies that T is conjugate to a 2-IET as well. $\square$

Lemma 2.5. *Suppose that m_1 and m_2 are not relatively prime. Let $d > 1$ be their greatest common divisor. Let P be the 2-IET which interchanges the intervals $I = [1 - \frac{1}{d}, 1)$ and $[0, 1) \setminus I$. Then there exists some $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$ such that T is conjugate to $P \circ R_{\alpha, I}$.*

Proof. If $m_2 > m_1$, then, as in the proof of the previous lemma, we can replace T by one of its conjugates so that the pair of return times m_1, m_2 is replaced by either $m_1, m_2 - m_1$ or $m_2 - m_1, m_1$. By repeating this several times if necessary, we can assume that $m_1 = m_2 = d$. By replacing T by another one of its conjugates, we can assume that for $i = 0, 1, \dots, d - 1$, the set $T^i(J)$ is an interval. We can also assume that these intervals are arranged in increasing order from left to right. Since these intervals all have the same length, and their total length is one, each must have length $\frac{1}{d}$. Therefore $T^{d-1}(J) = I = [1 - \frac{1}{d}, 1)$. Consider the action of T on $[0, 1)$: for $0 \leq i < d - 1$, $T^i(J)$ is translated directly onto $T^{i+1}(J)$, and $T^{d-1}(J)$ is mapped onto J but the intervals $T^{d-1}(J_1)$ and $T^{d-1}(J_2)$ get interchanged. This makes it clear that $T = P \circ R_{\alpha, I}$, where α is the length of J_2 . $\square$

The preceding lemmas show that T is conjugate to a 2-IET or an IET of the form $P \circ R_{\alpha, I}$, where $I = [1 - \frac{1}{d}, 1)$ for some integer $d > 1$ and P is the 2-IET

which exchanges I and $[0, 1) \setminus I$. We must show that these two cases are mutually exclusive. In the first case, T is conjugate to a minimal 2-IET, so all of its powers are minimal. In the second case, T^d is not minimal, since one of its conjugates maps the interval $[1 - \frac{1}{d}, 1)$ to itself. This shows that the two cases are not compatible.

It remains to show that, in either case, T has a root in $\mathbb{G}$. In the first case, the discussion on page 3 shows that T has roots of arbitrary order in $\mathbb{G}$. In the second case, let $I_j = [(j-1)\frac{1}{d}, j\frac{1}{d})$ for $j = 1, 2, \dots, d$. Let $(\beta_1, \beta_2, \dots, \beta_d)$ be the unique solution to the system of equations

$$\begin{pmatrix} 2 & 1 & 1 & 1 & \cdots & 1 \\ 1 & 2 & 1 & 1 & \cdots & 1 \\ 1 & 1 & 2 & 1 & \cdots & 1 \\ 1 & 1 & 1 & 2 & \cdots & 1 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & \cdots & 2 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \beta_1 \\ \beta_2 \\ \beta_3 \\ \vdots \\ \beta_{d-1} \\ \beta_d \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ \vdots \\ 0 \\ \alpha \end{pmatrix}.$$

We then have

$$(P \circ R_{\beta_1, I_1} \circ R_{\beta_2, I_2} \circ \cdots \circ R_{\beta_d, I_d})^{1+d} = P \circ R_{\alpha, I}.$$

Since T is conjugate to $P \circ R_{\alpha, I}$, this implies that T has a root in $\mathbb{G}$. The proof of Theorem 1.2 is complete. $\square$

Proof of Theorem 1.1. Let T be a minimal 3-IET. We have to prove that T has a root in $\mathbb{G}$ if and only if T fails to satisfy the i.d.o.c.

As we mentioned in the previous section, it follows directly from Theorem 1.2 that if T fails to satisfy the i.d.o.c., then T has a root in $\mathbb{G}$. For completeness, we repeat the argument here. Let β_1 and β_2 be the points where T is discontinuous. Since T is minimal, the orbits $\mathcal{O}_T(\beta_1)$ and $\mathcal{O}_T(\beta_2)$ are both infinite. Since T does not satisfy the i.d.o.c, it must be that $\mathcal{O}_T(\beta_1) = \mathcal{O}_T(\beta_2)$. So both discontinuities of T belong to a single T -orbit. Applying Theorem 1.2, we see that T has a root in $\mathbb{G}$.

Now suppose that T has a root in $\mathbb{G}$, say $T = S^n$, where $n \geq 2$. It is clear that S must be minimal. Since T is a 3-IET, Lemma 2.3 implies that there is only one maximal S -chain. So all of the discontinuities of S belong to a single S -orbit. Applying Theorem 1.2, we see that S must be conjugate to either a 2-IET or an IET of the form $P \circ R_{\alpha, I}$, where $I = [1 - \frac{1}{d}, 1)$ for some integer $d > 1$ and P is the 2-IET which exchanges I and $[0, 1) \setminus I$. In the first case, T is also conjugate to a 2-IET. Since all 2-IETs commute with one another, the centralizer $C(T)$ is uncountable. However, as we mentioned in the previous section, Novak [8] has proven that if $m \geq 3$, then any m -IET satisfying the i.d.o.c. has a countable centralizer. Therefore T does not satisfy the i.d.o.c. In the second case, observe that S^d is not minimal, since some conjugate of S^d maps the interval $[1 - \frac{1}{d}, 1)$ to itself. It follows that $T^d = S^{nd}$ is not minimal. Therefore, by Proposition 1.2, T^d must fail to satisfy the i.d.o.c. This implies that T does not satisfy the i.d.o.c. either. This completes the proof of Theorem 1.1. $\square$

Proof of Theorem 1.3. Let T be a minimal m -IET. Suppose that S is another IET and that there exists a natural number $n \geq 2$ such that $T = S^n$. We will prove that $\text{rank}(T) \leq 1 + \lfloor m/2 \rfloor$.

It is easy to see that $D(S^n) \subseteq \cup_{i=0}^{n-1} S^{-i}(D(S))$. Using this, one can verify that $\text{rank}(T) \leq \text{rank}(S)$. It is also clear that S must be minimal.

Let C denote the union of all maximal S -chains. Let $x \in C$. If x is greater than all other points in C , let $y_x = 1$. Otherwise, let y_x be the smallest point in C which is greater than x . The set C partitions the interval $[0, 1)$ into $|C|$ subintervals, each of which is of the form $I_x = [x, y_x)$, where $x \in C$. For each $x \in C$, let λ_x denote the length of I_x . Since $D(S) \subseteq C$, the partition of $[0, 1)$ determined by C is a refinement of the partition determined by $D(S)$. It follows that $\text{rank}(S)$ is at most equal to the dimension of the $\mathbb{Q}$ -vector space spanned by $\{\lambda_x : x \in C\}$. For convenience, we refer to this vector space as V . Our goal now is to show that $\dim(V) \leq 1 + \lfloor m/2 \rfloor$.

Let J be any one of the subintervals I_x . We apply Lemma 2.1. Since T is an m -IET, Lemma 2.3 tells us that there are at most $\lfloor m/2 \rfloor$ maximal S -chains. Lemma 2.2 then tells us that the set P described in Lemma 2.1 contains at most $\lfloor m/2 \rfloor$ points. Therefore, if $J_1, J_2, \dots, J_k$ and $m_1, m_2, \dots, m_k$ are as described in Lemma 2.1, then $k \leq 1 + \lfloor m/2 \rfloor$.

As we mentioned previously, the intervals $S^j(J_i)$, $1 \leq i \leq k$, $1 \leq j \leq m_i - 1$, are pairwise disjoint. We claim that each of these intervals must be completely contained in one of the intervals I_x . For if this were not the case, then some point in the interior of one of the J_i would belong to the backward orbit of a point in C . This point would then have to belong to the set P , a contradiction.

Since S is minimal, $\cup_{i=1}^k \cup_{j=0}^{m_i-1} S^j(J_i) = [0, 1)$. Combined with the observations in the previous paragraph, this proves that each of the subintervals I_x is a disjoint union of some of the intervals $S^j(J_i)$, $1 \leq i \leq k$, $1 \leq j \leq m_i - 1$. Since these intervals have at most $k \leq 1 + \lfloor m/2 \rfloor$ different lengths, it follows that $\dim(V) \leq 1 + \lfloor m/2 \rfloor$. Since we already observed that $\text{rank}(T) \leq \text{rank}(S) \leq \dim(V)$, this completes the proof of Theorem 1.3. $\square$

3. ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The author would like to thank Michael Boshernitzan for encouraging the author to investigate this topic, and for his numerous helpful suggestions, including a simplification of the author's original proof of Theorem 1.3.

REFERENCES

- [1] A. Avila, G. Forni, Weak mixing for interval exchange transformations and translation flows, *Annals of Mathematics*, **165** (2007), 637–664
- [2] M. Boshernitzan, Subgroup of interval exchanges generated by torsion elements and rotations, arXiv:1208.1023 (2012).
- [3] J. Chaika, Every ergodic transformation is disjoint from almost every interval exchange transformation, *Annals of Mathematics* **175** (2012), 237–253.
- [4] F. Dahmani, K. Fujiwara, V. Guirardel, Free groups of interval exchange transformations are rare, *Groups, Geometry, and Dynamics*, **7** (2013), 883–910.
- [5] M. Keane, Interval exchange transformations, *Mathematische Zeitschrift* **141** (1975), 25–31.
- [6] M. Keane, Non-ergodic interval exchange maps, *Israel Journal of Mathematics* **26** (1978), 188–196.

- [7] H. Masur, Interval exchange transformations and measured foliations, *Annals of Mathematics* **115** (1982), 168–200.
- [8] C. Novak, Discontinuity growth of interval exchange maps, *Journal of Modern Dynamics* **3** (2009), 379–405.
- [9] C. Novak, Continuous interval exchange actions, *Algebraic & Geometric Topology* **10** (2010), 1609–1625.
- [10] C. Novak, Interval exchanges that do not embed in free groups, arXiv:1007.3940 (2010).
- [11] G. Rauzy, Echanges d'intervalles et transformations induites, *Acta Arithmetica*, **34** (1979), 315–328.
- [12] W.A. Veech, Gauss measures for transformations on the space of interval exchange maps, *Annals of Mathematics* **115** (1982), 201–242.
- [13] W.A. Veech, Interval exchange transformations. *Journal d'Analyse Mathématique* **33** (1978), 222–272.
- [14] M. Viana, Ergodic theory of interval exchange maps, *Revista Matemática Complutense* **19** (2006), 7–100.
- [15] Y. Vorobets, Notes on the commutator group of the group of interval exchange transformations, arXiv:1109.1352 (2011).
- [16] J.C. Yoccoz, Interval exchange maps and translation surfaces, *Homogeneous flows, moduli spaces and arithmetic* (2007), 1–69.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, RICE UNIVERSITY, HOUSTON, TX 77005, USA

E-mail address: deb9@rice.edu